

# The Republican.

---

No. 15. Vol. 14.] LONDON, Friday, Oct. 20, 1826. [Price 6d.

---

## STATE OF THE REVIEWS.

THERE is a highly useful advance in this species of literature. The "Quarterly" has taken a step so as to come under the title of "Moderate Reformer." The "Edinburgh" plays pro and con, so as to make it questionable, whether it will take the late place of the "Quarterly," or outstrip the "Westminster" in liberalism. "The Westminster" is a solid publication of the kind, and does all the good that such a publication at such a time can do. I do not praise all its articles indiscriminately; but there have been some, highly important, in this age of struggle for free discussion. As many of the distant readers of "The Republican," might not be suited with the convenience of reading "The Westminster Review," I shall copy one of its articles entire, that on the Church Establishments, and reprint it as a tract. It contains many little admissions on the head of Religion and Christianity, which I should not have written; but where it is intended it should be read, those admissions may be even useful. Instead of saying that Church Establishments are hostile to Christianity, I, in my sense of Christianity, should have said, that they are essentially Christian. I protest against this play upon the word *Christianity*, that makes it synonymous with a system of good morals. It is a system of religion and has nothing to do with morals. Morality is outraged, when it is put under the name and garb of Christianity. It is a system of itself, of all that is good to man, and cannot be improved, but is corrupted, by any kind of alliance.

The Reviews have exercised great influence on the parties of this country. The "*well-as we are* men" have taken the "Quarterly" as the standard authority for their opinions. The Whigs, or they who have formed a standing opposition to all the measures of all men who might be in office, have made "The Edinburgh" their banner, and latterly, as a third party and a better party has grown up, discriminating fairly between the right and the wrong of the measures of all men and of all institutions established or proposed for establishment, "The Westminster" has grown up as an organ

for them. This new party, under the various names of Reformers, which they have assumed, or which have been assumed for them, has done much toward the breaking up of the two old parties, parties of near two or full two centuries standing, and there is some promise of an amalgamation of all parties in pursuit of sounder or the best known principles. Political personality has almost ceased; and measures, not men; principles, not politicians, are becoming the subjects, and the proper subjects, of review. This is a state of things at which good and well informed men will rejoice; and for the purpose of extending a knowledge of this state of things, I copy the following article.

R. C.

---

“ We intend, on the present occasion, as far as our limits will permit, to examine to the bottom the question of an Ecclesiastical Establishment, and more especially of the Church of England, in its effect on religion, on morality, on the character and actions of the clergy, on learning, on education, and on government.

“ We think it proper to begin by distinctly stating our opinion, that an ecclesiastical establishment is essentially antichristian; that religion can never be safe or sound, unless where it is left free to every man's choice, wholly uninfluenced by the operation either of punishment or reward on the part of the magistrate. We think it proper to go even further, and declare, that it is not religion only to which an ecclesiastical establishment is hostile: in our opinion, there is not one of the great interests of humanity, on which it does not exercise a baneful influence.

“ We know well to what we expose ourselves, by the promulgation of these great truths, for such they appear to us, and such we trust we shall establish them to be, by evidence which cannot be resisted. The clergy have, by a long course of usurpation, established a sort of right to call themselves and their interests, by the most sacred names. In ecclesiastical language, the wealth and power of the clergy are religion. Be as treacherous, be as dishonest, be as unfeeling and cruel, be as profligate, as you please, you may still be religious. But breathe on the interests of the clergy, make them surmise discredit at your hands, and you are the enemy of religion directly; nay, the enemy of your God; and all the mischief which religious prejudice and antipathy, the poisoned, deadly weapon of the clergy, can bring down upon its victims, is the sure and necessary consequence of your sacrilegious audacity.

“ For protection against this spirit of persecution, strong and formidable to the present hour, we look to public opinion, daily approaching to the condition of a match for this once gigantic foe; and the strong line which we trust we shall be able to draw between the interests of a corporation of priests, and those inte-



rests of religion about which alone good men can feel any concern.

“ We desire also to be understood as disapproving an injustice of which clergymen have often great reason to complain, that of confounding the character of individuals with the corporation to which they belong. We have very many bad corporations, in which excellent men are included, and such is the case of the priestly corporation. But the question is not how many clergymen, from the influence of education, and the spirit of the community to which they belong, are, in their private relation, and taken individually, estimable men. You may take a number of men, one by one, all virtuous and honourable, who yet, if you club them together, and enable them to act in a body, will appear to have renounced every principle of virtue, and in pursuit of their own objects will trample, without shame or remorse, upon every thing valuable to their fellow men.

“ We proceed upon the principle that men desire power, that they desire it in as great quantity as possible, and that they do not desire it for nothing. Men do not strive for power, that it may lie in their hands without using. And what is the use of it? The answer is plain. It is to make other men do what we please: to place their persons, their actions, and properties, to as great an extent as possible, at our disposal. This is known to be one of the strongest propensities in human nature, and altogether insatiable.

“ The ministers of religion are not less subject to this passion than other men. They are cited, proverbially, as an example of it in excess.

“ When acting singly, each confined to his own congregation, to the small circle of individuals to whom personally his ministry can extend, the quantity of power a minister of religion can derive from his influence over the minds which he directs, is too small to prompt him to hazard much for its acquisition. No inordinate thirst for power is excited, and any perversity either of doctrine or of conduct, attempted for that end, is observed too closely to escape detection. It is only on the large scale that success can attend those mischievous machinations. Whatever motives can operate upon a minister of religion, to be of use to his flock, as an example and monitor of good conduct, retain in the natural sphere their natural force, unchecked by the appetites which the prospect of acquiring an extensive command over other men regularly engenders.

“ When the whole, or the largest class of the ministers of religion, are aided by the magistrate in forming themselves into a body, so constituted as to act with united power, they become animated by the spirit which predominates in the leading men. This is a fact too certain to be disputed, and of which the causes are too obvious to require illustration. The spirit which predomi-

nates in the leading men is generated by the circumstances in which they are placed, the power immediately conferred upon them, and the prospect of increasing it without limits, by the means which they have at their disposal. That they will be actuated by the desire to make use of those means to the utmost, is a proposition which the history of human nature enables us to assume as undeniable. The man who would question it, is unworthy of an answer.

“ The great results, which spring from the combination of motives and powers, thus generated, is the subject to which the present article will be devoted ; and it is of an importance to justify a call for the best attention of our readers, and for a calm and unprejudiced consideration of the evidence which we have to adduce.

“ The peculiarity of the case of an incorporated clergy arises from the peculiarity of the means they have to employ. In the ordinary case of power, the influence over men's minds is the effect of the power. The power exists first, and the influence follows. In the case of clerical power, this order is inverted ; the influence comes first, and the power afterwards. The power is the result of the influence. The influence, therefore, is to be acquired in the first instance, and the greater the degree in which it is acquired, the greater the power which is the darling object of pursuit.

“ The first result which we shall mention, of this pursuit by the clergy, of influence over the minds of their countrymen, is the desire of the monopoly of that influence. They are naturally actuated by their thirst for influence to prevent all competition with themselves in obtaining it. Just in so far as they expect great consequences from possessing it perfect and undivided, so great must be their fears of having it shared, or lost, by the success of rivals. Rivals not only threaten them with the partial, or total deprivation of that which they desire to occupy entire ; but they bring the immediate not the problematical evil, of a great disturbance of ease. Without rivals a clergy can with little trouble possess themselves of the minds of their countrymen. They can riot in power and ease at the same time. To maintain their influence in competition with others, trouble must be taken at any rate. Diligence must be used, and that incessant. Vigilance must never go to sleep. Industry must never relax. But a life of labour and care is a very different thing from a life of security, indolence, and repose.

“ Nor is this all : sacrifices of another sort are required, by the competition with rivals. Abstinence, self-denial, and mortification are found to be powerful means of establishing a spiritual influence on the minds of men. Rivals, in order to be successful, have recourse to those means ; and the corporate clergy, in order not to be supplanted, are obliged to maintain themselves by



the same painful expedients. Instead of pleasure enjoyed in all its shapes, and credit derived from the display of it, they must practise all the appearances, and, for the sake of the appearance, much of the reality, of its renunciation.

"It thus appears, that almost every thing which is alluring to the mind of man, in actual power and pleasure, every thing which is dreadful to it in weakness, privation, and pain, urge and impel a corporate clergy to labour for the extinction of rivals.

"How steadily they have obeyed this impulse, their history declares. Of their expedients for the accomplishment of their object, the first and most conspicuous is, their application to the magistrate for the powers of persecution.

"It is not required for the present purpose that we should exhibit the persuasions they applied to the magistrate,\* to bring him to believe that it was for his interest to lend to them his power for the extermination of their rivals. That would be an instructive, but a voluminous exposure. What we can here attempt is, only to exhibit evidence, first, of their eager endeavours for this unrighteous end, and secondly, of the consequences which flowed from them.

"It is not probable that we shall be very inopportunately called upon for evidence of the persecuting endeavours of the Catholic church, through its various ages, from the time when the first Christian emperor declared himself in favour of a particular class of priests, down to the consummation of their power, first, in the extirpation of all competitors for the spiritual dominion in Christendom, and secondly, in the hold which, through that spiritual dominion, they obtained over every other power, wielding at pleasure the arms and the wealth of almost every Christian community. What we shall adduce will be such hints merely as are calculated to awaken the recollection of our readers.

"No time was lost. The first sovereign who protected the Christians was scarcely seated on his throne, when a fiery contest arose between the clergy of the Arian and the Athanasian creeds, for the possession of his ear. The Council of Nice, a memorable event, was summoned to determine the point, in other words, to satisfy the sovereign fully, which party, by its numbers and powers, it was most for his interest to join. The question was doubtful, and the balance for some time wavered. When the decision at last was made, and the Athanasian clergy became a distinguished body, with the power of government engaged for their

\* "A specimen of them appears in the tythe case of Charlemagne:—'His esteem for the piety and knowledge of the clergy tempted him to intrust that aspiring order with temporal dominion and civil jurisdiction; and his son Lewis, when he was stripped and degraded by the bishops, might accuse, in some measure, the imprudence of his father. His laws enforced the imposition of tythes, because the demons had proclaimed in the air that the default of payment had been the cause of the last scarcity.'—GIBBON, chap. xlix.

support, what were the consequences? Even the cold narrative of Mosheim conveys a pungent sense of the zeal with which they proceeded to deliver themselves from all competition, in obtaining influence over the human mind; their rage to establish a monopoly of spiritual dominion; to accomplish the extermination of rivals. Persecution flamed; blood was spilt; the non-conforming clergy, that is, non-conforming to the will of the leading divines, who now shared in the powers of government, were forbidden to teach: as often as they hazarded disobedience, they were thrown into prison, and subjected to other cruelties, not stopping short even of death.

“And above all things, great pains were taken to destroy their books.

“This was a capital point. Books were the most dangerous, and of course the most hated enemies, of a monopolizing clergy. No truths, not for their advantage; no exposure of lies which were; therefore no books but their own.

“Their strong and persevering purpose proved fatally effectual to its end. Of all the sects of Christians which appeared in the early centuries, the books, which are known to have been exceedingly numerous, were so completely extirpated, that a vestige of them scarcely remains; and it is with difficulty that a few scattered evidences can be collected of what those early and persecuted sects of Christians either believed or practised.

“Not only was all evidence of what they really were almost wholly obliterated, but their memory has been handed down to execration, by general accusations of the most disgusting vices, and the most atrocious crimes. Nor was it till the era of the Reformation, that some enlightened Protestants, beginning to ask what evidence was afforded of these imputed atrocities, disgraceful not only to professing Christians, but to human nature itself, discovered, to their infinite surprise, that there was no such thing: that of the little we really know of the ancient heretics, almost every thing goes to the disproof of the horrid accusations transmitted by the orthodox clergy, and tends to show, that both morality and learning were at a higher pitch among the heretics than among their exterminating enemies.

“Of the tendency, of the frame and bent, of the clerical mind, the word heretic involves evidence which reaches not the head only, but the heart. The early church used the Grecian language, and the word heresy is Greek. Exactly, correctly, literally, it signifies CHOICE. The crime of heresy, was the crime of making a CHOICE!

“There was the consummation of the clerical dominion! When it became execrable to make, and he became execrated who did make, a choice, that is, when the clergy might choose whatever other people were to choose, their power was thenceforward limited only by their will.



“ How their will operated, those of our readers who are the least acquainted with history, cannot stand in need of our information.

“ Not only did they give and take away crowns ; they boldly assumed that no crown could be righteously held, except at their discretion.

“ They subjected all Christendom to an enormous and destructive taxation for their own benefit ; having succeeded in the audacious attempt to persuade the magistrate, that because the Jewish tribe of Levi, which had no share in the holy land, had a tenth of its produce, the Christian clergy should have a tenth of the produce of the land of Christendom ; that is, as every man must eat his corn a tenth dearer, one-tenth part, for their use, of every man's labour in Christendom.

“ Nor was this extravagant exaction the only source to them of inordinate wealth. They levied taxes to a great amount in other forms, and persuaded magistrates and others to bestow upon them gifts, till a great proportion of the land in every country in Christendom, in some a half, in few less than a third, was in ecclesiastical hands.

“ The most profound and successful of all the advocates of Christianity against the modern objectors, the venerable and virtuous Campbell, introducing his account of what he calls ‘ the third grand expedient of the church, for securing the implicit obedience of her votaries, persecution,’ dates its commencement from the day and hour when ‘ Constantine embraced the faith, and gave the church a sort of political establishment in the empire ;’ and he adds the following important reflections :—

“ ‘ From the apologies of the Fathers before that period, (so the defences of our religion written by them are named) it is evident, that they universally considered persecution for any opinions, whether true or false, as the height of injustice and oppression. Nothing can be juster than the sentiment of Tertullian, which was, indeed, as far as appears, the sentiment of all the Fathers of the first three centuries. ‘ Non religionis est cogere religionem, quæ sponte suscipi debeat, non vi.’ And to the same purpose Lactantius, ‘ Quis imponat mihi necessitatem vel colendi quod nolim, vel quod velim non colendi ? Quid jam nobis ulterius relinquitur, si etiam hoc, quod voluntate fieri oportet, libido extorqueat aliena ?’ Again, ‘ Non est opus vi et injuria ; quia religio cogi non potest, verbis potius quam verberibus res agenda est, ut sit voluntas.’ Once more, ‘ Longe diversa sunt carnificina et pietas, nec potest aut veritas cum vi, aut justitia cum crudelitate, conjungi.’ Their notions in those days, in regard to civil government, seem also to have been much more correct than they became soon after. For all Christians, in the ages of the martyrs, appear to have agreed in this, that the magistrate's only

object ought to be the peace and temporal prosperity of the commonwealth.

“ ‘ But (such alas! is the depravity of human nature) when the church was put on a different footing, men began, not all at once, but gradually, to change their system in regard to those articles, and seemed strongly inclined to think, that there was no injustice in retaliating upon their enemies, by employing those unhallowed weapons in defence of the true religion, which had been so cruelly employed in support of a false: not considering, that by this dangerous position, that one may justly persecute in support of the truth, the right of persecuting for any opinions will be effectually secured to him who holds them, provided he have the power. For what is every man’s immediate standard of orthodoxy but his own opinions? And if he have a right to persecute in support of them, because of the ineffable importance of sound opinions to our eternal happiness, it must be even his duty to do it when he can. For if that interest, the interest of the soul and eternity, come at all within the magistrate’s province, it is unquestionably the most important part of it. Now, as it is impossible he can have any other immediate directory, in regard to what is orthodox, but his own opinions, and as the opinions of different men are totally different, it will be incumbent, by the strongest of all obligations, on one magistrate to persecute in support of a faith, which it is equally incumbent on another by persecution to destroy. Should ye object, that the standard is not any thing so fleeting as opinion: it is the word of God, and right reason. This, if ye attend to it, will bring you back to the very same point which ye seek to avoid. The dictates both of Scripture and of reason, we see but too plainly, are differently interpreted by different persons, of whose sincerity we have no ground to doubt. Now to every individual, that only amongst all the varieties of sentiments can be his rule, which to the best of his judgment, that is, in his opinion, is the import of either. Nor is there a possibility of avoiding this recurrence at last. But such is the intoxication of power, that men, blinded by it, will not allow themselves to look forward to those dreadful consequences. And such is the presumption of vain man (of which bad quality the weakest judgments have commonly the greatest share) that it is with difficulty any one person can be brought to think, that any other person has, or can have, as strong conviction of a different set of opinions, as he has of his.’ ”—Vol. ii. pp. 287—289.

“ This excellent writer then goes on to trace the progress of the evil.

“ ‘ I proceed to show the advances which, from time to time, were made, till that system of persecution, which, in a great part

\* “ Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, by George Campbell, D. D. Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen.



of the world, still obtains, was brought to maturity and established. For ages after the opinion first took place among Christians, that it was the magistrate's duty to restrain heretics by the infliction of civil penalties, they retained so much moderation, as not to think that the punishment could justly extend to death, or mutilation, or even to the effusion of blood. But now that the empire was become Christian, there gradually arose in it diverse laws against this new crime *heresy*, which are still extant in the codes of Theodosian and Justinian, imposing on the delinquents fines, banishments, or confiscations, according to the circumstances, and supposed degree, of the delinquency. All that regarded the execution of those laws, the trial as well as the sentence, devolved on the magistrate. Only the nature of the crime, what was heresy or schism, was determined by the ecclesiastical judge. One step in an evil course naturally leads to another. The first step was made when civil penalties were denounced against particular opinions and modes of thinking. This may be considered as the first stage of the doctrine and practice of intolerance in the Christian church. Nor could any thing be more explicitly, or more universally, condemned than this has been, by the Fathers of the first three centuries, and several of the fourth. *Humani juris et naturalis potestatis est*, said Tertullian, in the beginning of the third century, *unicuique quod putaverit colere*; and Hilary of Poitiers, in the fourth, in opposition to those who favoured the interposition of the magistrate. *Deus cognitionem sui docuit, potius quam exegit, et operationum cælestium admiratione, præceptis suis concilians auctoritatem, coactam confitendi se aspernatus est voluntatem*. Again, *Deus universalis est, obsequio non eget necessario, non requirit coactam confessionem: non fallendus est sed promerendus, simplicitate quærendus est, confessione discendus est, charitate amandus est, timore venerandus est, voluntatis probitate retinendus est. At vero quid istud, quod sacerdotes timere Deum vinculis coguntur, pænis jubentur? Sacerdotes carceribus continentur?* Men's system of conduct may come, we see, to be totally reversed. But this is always the work of time. Every advance has its difficulty, and is made with hesitation. But one difficulty surmounted emboldens a man, and renders it easier for him to surmount another. That again makes way for the next, and so on till the change be total.'—Vol. ii. pp. 293—295.

“ While the stupidity of the middle ages was still in its perfection, the fetters of the clergy upon the human mind were easily preserved from relaxation.

“ ‘ For some centuries,’ says Dr. Campbell, ‘ particularly the eighth, ninth, and tenth, remarkable for nothing so much, as the vilest superstition and grossest ignorance, and for insurrections, revolutions, and confusion, heretics and sectaries made but little noise, and were as little minded. With the revival of knowledge, even in its dawn, these also revived.’ ”—p. 299.

We shall continue this article and publish it separately as a tract. The taxation of the country is only to be reduced by the circulation of such tracts as these; by shewing where taxes are ill-founded or unjustly raised, and by shewing where they may be dispensed with. Every sixpence of state tax for the subject of religion is not only unjust; but, in a religious sense, is manifestly irreligious. It must be irreligious to tax a man for the encouragement of that which can only exist as a voluntary act. It is like saying to a man you shall pay for a god or idol, whether or not you will worship him. On what ground is that enforced payment founded? Would not the god or idol exist without a pecuniary support? Is it, after all the religious clamour, a god of gold and revenue? Shew the worshippers that it is not, by ceasing to tax them for its support. Shew, that the god, or the notion of the god, can exist without the aid of the taxation. If there were in reality such a god as is preached, a support by taxation would be the greatest outrage toward him that could be proposed. It puts the affair on the footing of *no pay, no god*. The god that is to be purchased is a dear god and had better be discharged. We are taxed for the possession of light and air in our houses, and taxed too for the phantom of a god. Religion, altogether, is nothing but a state trick, set up, as Paine correctly observed with regard to the Christian Religion, to monopolize power and profit. The Westminster Review is therefore so far of all the Reviews the most powerful advocate for the reduction of taxation, inasmuch as it attacks, with great ability, all taxes for the pretence of supporting religion.

R. C.

---

### BIBLE SOCIETY BICKERINGS.

---

WITH this society there is "death in the pot." Never will the members get over this squabble and unite in the circulation of the Bible. The society is attacked both internally and externally. To the contemners of the Bible, as a book of religious instruction, this squabble is a matter of indifference, other than as it proves, that such an institution, as the Bible Society, has no good foundation. We earnestly desire the most complete knowledge of the book to all persons desirous of obtaining it, or who, in any measure, contribute to the support of the religion which arises from it. This does not appear to be the case with all who thrive on that religion, as the following document shews:—



## THETFORD BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE meeting of the Bible Society at Thetford, last Thursday, was enlivened by an occurrence which will perhaps not be so unusual as it has been—an interruption from the Roman Catholic Priest. The Rev. Professor Scholefield used in his speech the words, "the blinded Roman Catholic," upon which the Priest rose, and desired an explanation of the sense in which the expression was applied. He said that he was sorry to disturb the harmony of the assembly, but as a member of that Church, he could not suffer such a calumny to pass unnoticed. The Professor declared his willingness to satisfy the inquiry, but it was determined that the business of the evening should proceed, and at its conclusion both parties should be heard. Accordingly, at the adjournment of the Bible Meeting, the Professor rose, and promising that he should confine himself to the subject on which he was speaking, the circulation of the Scriptures, he produced a document which he said he always carried with him, and confirmed his charge of blindness by the following facts:—

1. In the notes to the Roman Catholic version of the Bible, published at Rheims, and approved by the Right Rev. Bishop Troy, is the comment on Hebrew vii. 5, (unless we mistake,) "The Protestant version of the Bible is to be abhorred to the depths of hell."

2. In the Letters from Ireland, by J. K. L. (the Right Rev. Bishop Doyle) it is mentioned, and with high approbation, that a Parish Priest finding in the hands of a parishioner the English Bible, took it from him with the tongs, and buried it in the ground.

3. In a Bull by the present Pope, not only all Protestant versions of the Bible are prohibited under pains and penalties, but also the version by Martini, Archbishop of Florence.

The Professor concluded by declaring that he did not use the word "blinded" in reproach to the Roman Church, but in pity and hearty compassion to them, as wanting that glorious light which we enjoy.

The Priest, in reply, did not deny the facts adduced, but attempted to palliate them by observing that the acts of an individual were not to be charged on a church. He said the only difference between his Church and our's was, that we allowed the use of the Bible, unexplained, to all, while they allowed it only in an approved version, and accompanied with the interpretation which the Church ordained. Was the Roman Catholic layman to be calumniated because he submitted to the teaching of his church? The mischief of our unlimited use of the Bible was to be seen in the diversity of opinions and sects among us, which he illustrated by the various sentiments concerning baptism. As to the bull of the Pope he declared that the prohibition was not to be understood as denying the use of those versions, but only as insinuating (I pledge my ears for the word) insinuating that there were faults in the book.

With this the controversy terminated, and we must add that the best spirit was manifested on both sides. We could have wished that the Learned Professor had founded his charge on larger grounds than a few obscure facts, little known and less heeded. We will grant to the Romish Church that she does permit the use of the Bible to the laity, when properly guarded (pardon, Lord, the expression—Thy word guarded by man)—and we will only ask, during the 1800 years of the Romish Church, spread over the whole world, abounding too in learning, riches, and power,

how many copies of the Scriptures has she circulated? How many versions attempted? As many as the Protestant Church in 250 years, or as the Bible Society in twenty years? Hath Catholic Spain as many Bibles as Norfolk? Has the whole Catholic world as many as England? Do the Priests urge on their people the advantage and duty of reading the word of God? Are the Catholics in general acquainted with the Bible? On the answer which must be given to these questions we would found the charge (though we do not approve of making such charges, and unnecessarily hurting our neighbours feelings), that the Catholics are blinded, and blinding one another.—“Oh! my people, they which lead thee, cause thee to err.”—Isaiah.

We translate the following anecdote from *Les Archives du Christianisme*, a sort of French Christian Observer.—“We can attest the truth of the following fact. At a sale made after the decease of the minister of the village of Dosenheim (Lower Rhine), the end of last May, when the little library of the defunct was being sold, the minister of a neighbouring parish seized a volume, declaring that there were enough bad books in the world already, and this should not be sold. It was not sold, and our readers would be more afflicted than surprised to hear that the bad book was the New Testament of our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.”—*Norwich Post*.

Disagreement among the Christians seems to have been and to be universal, and this too proves the bad foundation of Christianity. The religion under which all are to unite in a fictitious future life is a source of universal dissension in this! Better for us to unite here and settle matters as to the future when we meet in future. In the following speech of Lord Bexley's, his lordship seems to scout the notion that infidels are zealous distributors of the Bible; and he scouts it too under the idea, “that the kingdom of Satan is not so divided against itself.” The kingdom of Christ does not appear to be so well managed! But the kingdom of Satan (Wisdom) knows that the circulation of the Bible has been Satan's triumph in Europe:—

*The 14th Anniversary of the Kent Auxiliary Bible Society was held at the Court Hall, Maidstone, on Thursday last.*

“On a Resolution being unanimously passed, expressing the thanks of the Meeting to Lord Bexley for his services in the Chair, his Lordship in returning his acknowledgments, made several observations, which were to the following effect:—

“Ladies and Gentlemen,—I felt it to be a duty, not only to the respectable individuals, by whom I was invited, but also to myself, to attend this Meeting, for I feel it is services like these that become my declining years. After passing a great part of my life in the services of my earthly King, the remainder of my days are due to that Heavenly Monarch, who rules over all; and while I have health and strength, I cannot better employ them



than in labouring in his cause. Much has this day been said on the subject of the late unfortunate dissensions, but I feel desirous to add a few observations. One gentleman has very accurately stated the allégations as divided under four principal heads:—The Apocrypha—the foreign versions—the foreign agents—and the application of the funds of the Society. With respect to the Apocrypha, I am bound to say, that the Committee, with the most anxious labour, went to the bottom of that question, but the discussions, though painful and tedious, were conducted in a general spirit of Christian charity, each party giving to the other the fullest credit for good intention. Indeed, the difference of opinion was only as to what would be the best mode of dealing with the question. The result was, that the question was set at rest for ever. I shall add nothing to what has already been said to-day upon the subject of the Foreign versions: for, in all cases, they were published under the inspection of persons the best qualified for the task, which is a sufficient answer to that head of objection. We now come to the Foreign correspondents. Really it is surprising to what lengths some persons have gone in this business. I will just read a few words from an Edinburgh paper relative to this charge. [Here his Lordship read an extract, which in substance accused the Society of engaging infidels to circulate the Scriptures abroad.] Then from this it appears that infidels in all parts of the world are the agents of the Bible Society! Now, I will venture to say, that the assertion is the grossest absurdity ever put forth, for it resolves itself into this—that all the infidels of Europe are anxious to circulate the Holy Scriptures. Oh, no! the kingdom of Satan is not so divided against itself. Really, if we did not know that men of ability and learning have been imposed upon by such an allegation, we should think it impossible that party spirit could carry any person to such a length. But let us look at the mischief it does. This charge, and others like it, are copied and circulated in Catholic vicinities, where perhaps they are in their place, for we have the authority of the Pope to prove, that the Society for the circulating the Scriptures ought to be put down; and these charges give strength to the objections of the Catholics. Next is the charge about the expenditure of the funds—the payment of the Secretaries and Agents. The pamphlet I hold in my hand says it is strange that no gentlemen can be found to serve the Society without a salary of three hundred pounds per annum. On that point I can speak with great confidence. I believe that no one who knows any thing of the Bible Society is ignorant of the fact that the first Secretary was Dr. Owen; and afterwards were associated with him, Mr. Hughes, a Minister of the Baptist persuasion; and the Rev. D. Steinkopff, a Minister of the Lutheran Church. At the outset of the Society the labours of the Secretaries were not very considerable, but as it got on beyond all expectation, in a few years,

the duties of the office called for a much greater portion of the time and talent of the Secretaries; and I have heard that Dr. Owen sacrificed by his attendance on the Bible Society a living of 1,200l. a-year; but he always refused to receive any salary, and he died in the prime of life, leaving his family in very indifferent circumstances. On the death of Dr. Owen, it was resolved that 300l. per annum should be given to each of the Secretaries, and after nineteen years' service the two survivors, with the Rev. Mr. Brandam, were prevailed on to accept that very moderate remuneration. With respect to the agents abroad, it is not to be expected that, besides the sacrifice of men's whole time and talents, they should go into banishment in foreign countries, without any remuneration. Dr. Pinkerton, a man of great ability, piety, candour, and benevolence, received for his labours abroad 400l. a-year. Mr. Leeves was stationed at Constantinople in the dangerous service of there distributing the Holy Scriptures, in doing which he had displayed great discretion and judgment. He was allowed 300l. per annum. Another small allowance was made to Mr. Barker, at Aleppo, which when we consider the danger of plague and earthquake to which he is constantly exposed, must be admitted to be but reasonable. Another agent who has travelled a great deal in America in the cause of the Society, and who is now engaged in an expedition of great danger and difficulty which will occupy several years, also received a moderate remuneration. Leander Von Ess, who by his own personal exertions has circulated an immense number of the Holy Scriptures on the Continent, receives only 300l. a-year for his expenses, including carriage of books, package, and postage, and other incidental charges occasioned by the circulation of the Scriptures. Having said these few words by way of explanation, I think you will agree with me that the charge of extravagant expenditure is entirely without foundation. But full details will be speedily laid before the public. I have only entered into this slight sketch, to enforce upon your minds the necessity for increased exertion, for it cannot be denied that the Society has lost some support. It has suffered a diminution of its patronage and of its funds; though to what extent cannot yet be ascertained. It therefore is incumbent on all its well-wishers to act with increased liberality, and to give a greater portion of their time, their talents, and their earnest prayers for the promotion of its prosperity and success."

---

#### TITHES.

---

THERE was a meeting of the Citizens of London in Common Hall, yesterday (the 19th inst.), to petition against the Corn



Laws. Mr. Henry Hunt was the only person among them who said any thing to the purpose or that was calculated to lead to the necessary relief from the present state of things. After a variety of observations he came to the following points:—

In coming to speak of the expenditure of the country, he could only recur to the old topic. Let them begin at the head—begin with the King, and go down through all the Royal Family, retrenching, in every instance, the salaries at present allowed. They might take the Crown lands, which were, in fact, the property of the country. These lands had continued the revenue of the Crown for a considerable time, until George III. finding that the Ministers occasionally used them for their own purposes, asked how it was that certain dukes and lords should be permitted to touch his lands? “Why,” said the Minister, “how do you think we can secure their votes otherwise?” “Oh,” replied the King, (who whatever Peter Pindar and others might say of him, was a man sharp enough), “then take the lands to yourselves altogether, but give me something certain.” And in consequence they did so, giving him £800,000 a year in lieu of them. Were he (Mr. Hunt) a Minister, he would sell all those lands for the advantage of the community. He would also take all the tithes (laughter and cheers)—leaving the clergy, of course, a sufficient and decent subsistence. He would (with all respect to the gentlemen behind him) take all Corporation lands, for it was very apparent that they were not always scrupulously managed. The story of the bequest of a penny loaf annually given at Devizes to every inhabitant and passenger, which was suspended by the Corporation of that City for seven years, in order, as they said, to make it a sevenpenny loaf, and then entirely forgotten, was a sufficient illustration of this assertion. In conclusion, he was confident no real good would emanate to this country without a thorough alteration in the whole system, and he hoped to see the day when the stone figure to which he pointed (Mr. Pitt) would be removed from Guildhall, and taken into the public streets and Macadamized.

On this, the Times newspaper observes:—

Tithes were also the subject of attack. We are sorry for this. We would leave the injustice of plundering the church to the landed interest only. The fact is, that the agricultural party cannot meet, without indicating their hankering after this property. They think they have it in their grasp. What right a body of merchants and traders have to join in the iniquity, we know not. They can gain nothing by it; and we are sure the poor man will be a loser. For our own parts we hope the distress of the country will not induce the belief that a remedy may be found by depriving its inhabitants of religious instruction, and of abolishing an intelligent, learned, and respectable clergy, for only greater distress could ensue from such a course. Seize lay-impropriations if you please, for they may be founded in such iniquity as no prescription can render sacred.”

Plundering the Church indeed! What is a Church, but a congregation of the people, a congregation of those whom the Times would call plunderers? To apply the property of the church to the relief of other burthens, the people would but apply a choice of their own means, and not plunder any one. Cease to ordain plunderers to holy orders, and there will be no individuals

to suffer by an application of church property to better purposes. No, no, Mr. Editor of 'The Times,' the inhabitants of this country will not lose their religious instruction through the right application of the church property. There will be tricksters enough left to give them that instruction for what they can extract from the purse through the will. Your judgment in this matter is either interested or defective. Sooner or later, this church property must be broken up to lessen other taxes; and corporation property will share the same fate. It has been unjustly obtained, unjustly accumulated and mischievously applied. I was glad to see Mr. Hunt speaking out on this important matter, and when or wherever he, or any other person, does so speak out, as to let it be clearly seen what and what only is meant, my approbation and support shall never be wanting.

R. C.

---

LINES ON CONTEMPLATING THE STATUE OF THE VENUS  
DE MEDICIS.

BY THE REV. ROBERT TAYLOR.

*(Originally published in the Morning Post.)*

---

WHEN grieved, tormented, irritated, vexed,  
O'erwhelmed with troubles, and with cares perplex'd,  
Hither I turn my meditating eyes,  
By soft transition,—softer feelings rise.  
Victorious Venus! thy almighty charms  
Attest Love's triumphs o'er a world in arms.  
Let canting hypocrites to creeds adhere!  
The LOVE DIVINE, the SOV'REIGN GRACE, is here.  
Had only here, that Love and Grace been sought,  
Martyrs had never bled, nor heroes fought:  
No wars, no wrongs, the priest-gulled world had known;  
Nor aught of violence—save Love alone,—  
All feel Love's gentle influence! Love's soft book  
Bids War forget his sword, and Craft his book.  
The fierce barbarian feels his soul refin'd,  
And Saints, themselves, grow merciful and kind.  
Thus, when strong passions Nature's hand supplied,  
She bade the strongest lean to Virtue's side.



## CRITERIONS OF TRUTH IN SPECULATIVE QUESTIONS.

---

MANY persons have been desirous of obtaining a compendious view of the opinions of celebrated men in all ages subsequent to the Christian era, respecting the truth of Revealed Religion. The exercise of our own judgment, where we possess any, in matters of religion, is the best mode of arriving at just conclusions: but as people, out of the laziness of their nature, prefer rather to pin their faith on authority than to seek diligently for truth, a careful investigation and statement of the opinions of great men is admitted to be the next best way of obtaining a right opinion of one's own. Christianity is to be tried by three distinct several tests. Its truth or falsehood is to be sought for in the solution of the three following questions.—

1. *Is the scheme of Christianity consistent with Nature, or, in other words, does it agree with, instead of forming any sort of contradiction to, the ordinary course of natural phenomena, which are the subjects of our positive sensations, and therefore the only true foundations of our knowledge?* All sensible men are more or less judges of this question; but natural philosophers may be said to be more eminently qualified to decide on it, from their closer attention to nature, and from their more constant and regular exercise of the reasoning powers of the mind on the subject of natural objects, and from their more extensive knowledge of the universe. The lazy Infidel has the satisfaction on this question to have the greatest astronomers, chemists, naturalists, mathematicians, and above all, the metaphysicians, on his side—and that, too, all over Christendom. In France, Des Cartes, D'Alembert, Diderot, Baillie, La Lande, La Place, and I might name fifty more, all great astronomers and mathematicians, were decidedly Infidels; not to mention Buffon and nearly all the naturalists; Rousseau, the very child of Nature; and nearly the whole of the medical faculty. In England, Newton, Hobbes, Locke, Bacon, Hume, and nearly the whole of the more intelligent of the medical profession. Among Spaniards, Spinoza. In Prussia, the intelligent King Frederick the Second. I need not multiply examples.

2. *Is Christianity capable of historical proof? that is, Will the history of mythology in general bear us out in an attempt to separate Christianity in particular from the numerous other religions mutually contradicting each other; so that we may pronounce Christianity exclusively true and the rest false?* Here the indolent unbeliever may have recourse to the authority of the ingenious,

learned, and spiritual Voltaire; to the eloquent Volney, deeply read in ancient lore; to Dupuis, whose "History of all Religions" is a master-piece of learning that combines history, mythology, and astronomy. He may then apply to Bayle, author of the "Historical Dictionary;" to J. Horne Tooke, the prototype of etymologists; and Gibbon, who shewed the causes of the rapid spread of Christianity. Great Greek scholars, as critical judges of the language in which the Septuagint was translated and the Gospels written, ought not to be passed over; and Professor Porson, supereminent in knowledge of Greek manuscript, the critic of the Alexandrian MS. was a decided Infidel. The same may confidently be said of Heyne and of Wolf, the editors of Virgil and Homer, in Germany; and indeed of most great classical scholars every where. Heyne, in his notes to Pollis, calls Christians, *quidam homines vana religione capti*. We may then read Tacitus, Pliny, and Josephus, cotemporary historians with the Apostles, and who either wholly omitted to notice the momentous advent of the pretended Messiah, or spoke of Christians, never naming Christ at all, as a set of puny, obstinate fanatics, &c.

3. *Has Christianity, with all its boasted pretensions to a divine origin, succeeded in making men better, wiser, and happier, than they were before—or has it totally failed to do all these things?* Here our best references would be to such men as Jeremy Bentham, the late Patrick Colquhoun, and other writers on metropolitan police; or to the keepers of gaols, brothels, and gaming-houses; to the followers of campaigns, to the physicians, to hospitals; or to the editor of the Newgate Calendar. When I hear people talking of the success of Christianity, and witness its total failure whichever way I turn myself, I hardly know whether most to censure the mendacity, to laugh at the stupidity, or to commiserate the wretchedness of my Christian fellow-creatures. Let a Hindoo worship his idol, he worships it in the spirit of benevolence, and protects all animal life against violence, under a belief of the transmigration of souls. But let us see what the Christian, the avowed "temple of the transmigrated Holy Ghost," does; let us view him at a bull-baiting and boxing match, or a Shrove Tuesday cock-throwing, and in all the wickedness, filth, and misery, that London streets exhibit; and then let us seek the solution of the last question proposed in the unquestionable evidence of the failure of Christianity, which daily experience every where presents to our view.

When we consider all these things, and consider also that the greatest vices and the deepest hypocrisy have ever prevailed among the Evangelical teachers of the Gospel—while Atheists, Deists, and Infidels in general, have generally been the best of men—we cannot be long in making up our opinion of Christianity: but let us never seek to oppose that or any other super-



stitution by any means but by fair argument and persuasion. I would not even ridicule Religion, but would in many cases transfer that deference and respect, which Religion falsely claims, to the character and offices of those mistaken persons who embrace her tenets. Violence is the argument of Religion, but can never become the weapon of Philosophy. Again, questions of religion should never be mixed with politics. I respect the Government of my country. I participate in the sentiment of all rational men of admiration at the enlightened policy of his Majesty's present Administration. And I say, that any one who should make Religion or Infidelity a pretext for creating a disturbance in a country rising, as ours is, in excellence of legislation and a sound commercial policy, would be too bad and worthless a patriot ever to become a good cosmopolitan, and would be by no means entitled to the character of a Reformer. No, I do say, *let discussion in matters of Religion be free*; let them be conducted with coolness, with caution, and with courage, as to any result. Let us live to learn something of every body, never arguing upon prejudice, nor ever yielding to prejudice—and, above all, never exhibiting the least degree of timidity. If argument come again in the form of Oppression, meet it manfully, as Richard Carlile did! Prudence has nothing to dread from the tread of Fortune—nor Wisdom from brute force. The time is fast approaching when the illusions of Superstition will vanish. I have no prejudices either for or against any religion. Prove to me that Christianity be true, and I will fall down at the feet of the Virgin and worship the Cross. Establish the authority of the Prophet of Mecca, and I will enlist myself under the banners of the Crescent, and hope in a Mohammedan Elysium. I desire nothing but fair argument, and solicit truth alone. And though there are religious bigots in plenty still leagued to oppose truth all over Europe, their arrows will be like the shafts from the mighty giants of old who warred with Heaven; they will fall powerless from the shield of Pallas as from a tinkling cymbal.

Nam quid Typhœas et validus Mimas,  
Quid Rhæsus, evulsisque truncis  
Enceladus jaculator audax,  
Contra sonantem Palladis ægida  
Possunt ruentes.

Yours, &c.

O. O.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

---

THE No. 11, of this work just published contains as usual some excellent articles, the first of which is on the formation and publication of opinions : and if the religionists will but rightly consider the following paragraphs, which I extract, they will see that they have not even a creed that will bear the test of evidence : that in fact, for want of evidence, they believe nothing on the subject of religion ; but merely indulge in reveries. Their belief is phantasmal, and should be treated of under that light, separating imaginary beliefs from beliefs founded on the evidence of things or what we know to be realities.

R. C.

“ Generally speaking, belief is the result of evidence. Where there is no evidence, there is no belief. Where there is evidence, there is belief. Evidence admits of degrees : it may be stronger or weaker. In like manner, belief admits of degrees. Belief may be stronger or weaker ; and its strength or weakness corresponds to the strength or weakness of the evidence. It is not meant that the same evidence appears always of equal strength to every man : that is very far from being the case ; it is far from appearing always of the same strength to the same man. It is meant, however, that whatever the strength which evidence at any time appears to a man to bear, such at that time is the degree of his belief. The proof is indisputable, because the view which the mind takes of evidence, and its belief, are only two names for one and the same thing. The feeling of the force of evidence, and belief, are not two mental states ; they are one and the same state. A man regards a piece of evidence as convincing : this is but another phrase for saying he is convinced.

“ In the word evidence, there is an equivocation to which it is necessary to attend, in order to have any chance for clear ideas on the subject.

“ Sometimes the word evidence means what is calculated to be evidence, whether it is by any mind taken into view as such or not. At other times, we call a thing evidence, only when it is taken into view as such by some particular mind. Many things there are, which would be evidence to your mind, if they were present to it, in a certain way. Not being present to it, they are not evidence to you, how much soever calculated in their own nature to be so, or however strongly they may be evidence to other minds to which they are present in that appropriate mode. Nothing is evidence to any mind till it is taken into view by



that mind, along with the point, whatever it is, of which it is evidence. A thing may be calculated to be evidence, without being so, either to you, or to any of your fellow creatures. Nothing is evidence to any man but what is brought home to him. Strictly speaking, therefore, nothing is evidence, but what is regarded and taken into account as such. That which is only calculated to be evidence, is not evidence. It becomes evidence, only, when it is surveyed by a mind by which its evidentiary virtue is perceived. That, however, which is only thus calculated to become evidence, is very often called evidence. And, thus two things, which it is of great importance to distinguish, are confounded under one and the same name; that which is evidence to a man, actually present to his mind, and producing its appropriate effect; and that which is not present to his mind, nor producing any effect. What is evidence to your mind now, because it is present to it, was not evidence to it yesterday, when it had never been present to it. The same thing exists therefore in two states relative to your mind, the state of evidence, and the state not of evidence. It would be very useful to have names to distinguish these two states. In the first it may be called evidence, in the second, it is only matter fit to become evidence. If a short term could be found, to supply the place of this many-worded name, 'matter fit to become evidence,' it would be very convenient. Our language, which, unhappily, has no future participles, makes it very difficult to frame a good name. Perhaps, as we have made credential from credence, to answer a very good purpose, namely, to express what is calculated to give credence, so we might use the word evidential, to express a thing calculated to become evidence. Thus we should have two convenient words, evidence, and evidential; the one to express the thing when considered as evidence, the other to express its character when considered as only fit to become evidence.

"We also want a term to express an object, which has not yet become an object of either belief, or disbelief; but may become an object of the one or the other. When believed, it is called an object of belief, when disbelieved an object of disbelief. But what is it to be called, while it is yet an object of neither; and while it is unknown, of which it is fitted to be an object? In that case, it is an object of scepticism—scepticism meaning literally suspense of judgment, till evidence is obtained. And, if scepticism had not a bad meaning attached to it, an object of scepticism would have been a very proper name for the object in question. Let us in this sense suppose an object of scepticism, a mathematical proposition, for instance; by what process does it become an object of belief, or of disbelief? Through the medium of evidentials. Evidentials are not evidence, till they do evidence; that is, effect belief. A demonstration, before it is

known, is an evidential; when it becomes known, it is evidence, and the feeling of the evidence is belief.

"There is in evidentials, such a thing as a power of becoming evidence; that is of producing belief in the mind that duly appreciates their evidentiary nature.

"If there is not this power in evidentials, there is no such thing as truth; for truth is that which there is reason for believing. The reason for believing any thing, is the evidence of it. The reason for calling any thing truth, is because the evidence for believing it is so strong, that it cannot be doubted; that is, the mind cannot forbear believing it, when the evidentials of it are present to the mind,

"I believe that the sun exists. That proposition I call a truth. Why? Because when I look at the sun, I have a sensation, which, as an evidential of the sun's existence, renders it impossible for me not to believe his existence.

"That the three angles of a rectilineal triangle are equal to two right angles. I call a truth. The reason here also is, that, when I evolve the demonstration, it yields me evidence of the proposition, in other words, produces belief; nor is it possible for me to carry my mind along the demonstration, and resist the belief.

"If there is such a thing then, as truth in the world, there is such a thing as irresistible evidence. But where evidence is irresistible, of course the belief is not voluntary, it is not in the power of the mind to receive, or not to receive it.

"That there is in the world truth, certain truth, it is a new thing for the advocates of religion to draw into doubt. This was wont to be their accusation against the sceptics. It is the more to be wondered at, that the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, a clergyman of Glasgow, should have thought it necessary to arraign Mr. Brougham, for declaring, in his 'Inaugural Discourse,' that when evidence is present to the human mind, belief is not a voluntary, but a necessary consequence.

"The Rev. Dr. Wardlaw does, in this case, what is so very apt to be done by a man who does not like a certain proposition, and yet sees danger in disavowing it; he both attacks and maintains the doctrine.

"First, let us hear what he says in affirmation of it. 'I am far,' such are his words, 'from intending to question the soundness of the axiom, that belief must necessarily correspond with the perception of evidence, it being in the nature of the thing impossible, that the mind should believe otherwise than as evidence is, or is not discerned. It is quite entitled to the designation of an axiom, being a self-evident and indisputable truth.' No admission can be more full and unequivocal.

"What, then, is the quarrel he has with Mr. Brougham; this



and nothing but this, being the truth which Mr. Brougham has promulgated? 'If it be true,' says Dr. Wardlaw, 'that for his belief, whatever it may be, a man is no more the subject of praise or blame, than he is for a light or a dark complexion, or for the dimensions of his corporeal frame; then it follows, not merely that man should not account to man for his belief, but also, and with equal certainty, that man has no account to render for his belief to God. . . . We dare not hesitate to say that, between this sentiment and the most explicit statements and uniform assumptions of the Bible, there is a fearful contrariety. Our orator and the inspired penman are quite at issue.'

"But to us it appears, that the inspired penmen are not more at issue with the orator, than they are with the divine. The divine says, 'It is quite impossible that the mind should believe otherwise than as evidence is, or is not discerned.' Then a man is not responsible for his belief, assuredly; for it does not depend on him, but on the evidence.

"What, then, does the divine proceed to prove? That a man is responsible for his belief? No; but for a very different thing; for his mode of dealing with evidence.

"It is a very mischievous proceeding, to confound these two things; and attach, as the reverend author does, to the one, the consequence which belong to the other. From this confusion, the spirit of prosecution derives its principal means of accomplishing its nefarious ends.

"For what purpose does the reverend doctor, as if in averting some dreadful evil, put forth all his strength to establish a proposition, which no one in the world ever called in question; that a man may deal fairly, or unfairly with evidence, and may, in dealing unfairly with it, contract various degrees of guilt, from the lowest to the highest, perhaps, which can be imputed to a human being. Surely he does not mean to say, that Mr. Brougham disputes that proposition. Does not Mr. Brougham use the word prejudice, like other men? As often as he does so, he evinces his belief, that men deal unfairly as well as fairly with evidence; and thereby contract guilt, as far as the want of regard to truth implies it.

"The quality, then, of the line of conduct pursued on this occasion, is as follows. The odium which would be justly due to any attempt to deny or explain away the criminality which may be involved in dealing unequally, negligently, or dishonestly with evidence, the reverend author endeavours to excite in the highest possible degree. Having done his best to excite this odium, he so frames his language, as to attach it to the proposition maintained by Mr. Brougham. The proposition maintained by Mr. Brougham, is a proposition undoubtedly true, as is affirmed by the reverend author himself, and it is a proposition of the highest possible importance, as all the world must allow. Yet the re-

verend author does his best to attach odium to this great and salutary truth, and to the man who lent the aid of his powerful name to its dissemination.

"We are perfectly satisfied that Dr. Wardlaw has thus deeply sinned in ignorance, and if he had not totally mistaken the nature of his act, would have been one of the last of men to have adopted so reprehensible a proceeding. No declaration against persecution can be more clear and comprehensive than his. 'It is a truth,' he says, and says honourably to himself, and usefully to the world; 'that men *ought* no longer to be led, and it would be a joyful truth, if truth it were, that they are *resolved* no longer to be led, blindfold in ignorance. It is a truth, that the principle which leads men to judge and treat each other, not according to the intrinsic merit of their actions, but according to the accidental and involuntary coincidence of their opinions, is a vile principle. It is a truth that man should not render account to man for his belief. And, in as far as this is meant to express the grand principle of universal toleration, there is no length to which I would not cheerfully go along with its eloquent and powerful advocate; the very word, *toleration*, seeing a right to tolerate, supposes the existence of a corresponding right to restrain and coerce, being a term which, in such an application of it, no language ought to retain. Men should be as free to think, as they are free to breathe. I make no exceptions. Let truth defend herself; and defend herself by her own legitimate means. She is well able to do so. Nor does she stand in need of any auxiliary methods, beyond those of fair argument and rational persuasion. Give her an open field, and the free use of her weapons, and she will stand her ground. Legal restraint and suppression have invariably had the effect of giving tenfold prevalence to the dreaded error. And measures of coercion, whilst they have made hypocrites by thousands, have never made, and never can make, one genuine convert to her cause.'

"A man, capable of thus nobly expressing himself, respecting freedom of thought, could not have been betrayed into the exceptionable mode of commenting, which he has thought it his duty to employ, on the language of Mr. Brougham, respecting the great law of belief, had he not, under the influence of a bad habit, which a bad education renders most extensively and most unhappily prevalent, overlooked and neglected the distinction between the impression which the mind receives from evidence, such as it is presented, and the mental process which is subservient to the presenting of it.

"The importance of the distinction, thus fatally, and thus frequently overlooked, the consequences attached to its observance, and its non-observance, will amply justify some pains bestowed upon the illustration of it.

"First of all, we think it necessary to let Dr. Wardlaw see the



opinion entertained by other divines, of the greatest eminence, as well as by philosophers, respecting the impression derived from evidence. In other words, the law of the great mental phenomenon, belief.

"We cannot adduce a name of greater authority, than that of the celebrated Dr. Clarke, a man, uniting, in his own person, some of the highest attributes, both of a divine, and a philosopher. The following are two out of many passages, which his voluminous writings afford.

"The eye, when open, sees the object necessarily, because it is passive in so doing. The understanding likewise, when open, perceives the truth of a speculative proposition, necessarily, because the understanding also is passive in so doing. . . . Neither God nor man can avoid seeing that to be true, which they see is true; or judging that to be fit and reasonable, which they see is fit and reasonable.'—Clarke, *Answer to the First Letter from a Gentleman at Cambridge*.

"Without all dispute, perception of ideas is no action at all. . . . Seeing a thing to be true or false is not an action, nor has any thing to do with the will. . . . Being unable to refuse our assent to what is evidently true, is not an action, but a perception.'—Clarke, *Remarks upon a Book, intitled, A Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty*.

"In the following passages, we have the sentiments of the great Chillingworth:—

"Perhaps you mean such points of faith, as the person to whom they are proposed understands sufficiently to be truths revealed by God. But how, then, can he possibly choose but believe them? Or how is it not an apparent contradiction, that a man should disbelieve what himself understands to be a truth; or any Christian what he understands or but believes to be testified by God? This indeed is impossible.'—Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants: The Answer to the Preface*.

"If men do their best endeavour to free themselves from all error, and yet fail of it through human frailty, so well am I persuaded of the goodness of God, that if in me alone should meet a confluence of all such errors of all the Protestants in the world, I should not be so much afraid of them all, as I should be to ask pardon for them.'—*Id. Ib.*

"He that would question, whether knowing a thing, and doubting of it: much more, whether knowing it to be true, and believing it to be false, may stand together, deserves, without question, no other answer but laughter. Now, if error and knowledge cannot consist, then error and ignorance must be inseparable. Him that does err, indeed, you can no more conceive without ignorance than long without quantity, virtuous without quality, a man and not a living creature, to have gone ten miles

and not to have gone five, to speak sense and not to speak.'—*Id. Ib.*

"The following is from another controversial divine of great eminence, who was not liable to the imputation of yielding any thing willingly to the sceptics:—

" 'The fundamental error in Mr. Bayle's argument seems to be this: He saw the essential differences of things; he found those differences the adequate object of the understanding; and so too hastily concluded them to be the adequate object of the will likewise. In this he was mistaken: they are, indeed, the adequate object of the understanding; because the understanding is passive in its perceptions: and, therefore, under the sole direction of those necessary differences. But the will is not passive in its determinations; for instance, that three are less than five, the understanding is necessitated to judge, but the will is not necessitated to chuse five before three.'—*Warburton, Div. Leg. B. I. Sec. 4.*

"The proof that belief is not voluntary, is well put by Barrow, in his First Sermon on Faith; but the passage is too long for insertion. Instead of it, take the following from a man of great name, and a tract of great merit:—

" 'This is the miserable condition of a convict heretic; the punishment which fell on him for expressing thoughts heretical, he must continue to endure for barely thinking; which is a thing not in his own power, but depends on the evidence that appears to him.'—Bishop Hare, *Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures in the way of private Judgment.*

"After these specimens of the mode of thinking on this important subject, among rational theologians, we shall present but a few examples from the writings of philosophers, but those men of the highest name, and of no doubtful character in respect to their faith.

" 'That a man should afford his assent to that side on which the less probability appears to him, seems to me utterly impracticable, and as impossible as it is to believe the same thing probable and improbable at the same time.'—Locke, *Hum. Underst. B. IV. Ch. 20. Sect. 15, 16.*

" 'The mind of man is necessarily passive in two important manners, either as truth, real or apparent, demands its assent; or, as falsehood, real or apparent, demands its dissent. It is in consequence of this passivity of the human mind, which I chuse to call passivity intellectual, that it becomes susceptible of discipline and institution, and thus finds itself adorned (according as it is cultivated) with the various tribes both of arts and sciences.'—Harris' *Philos. Arrang. Ch. XI.*

"This intellectual passivity is completely implied in one of the



leading rules of Descartes' Philosophy. '*Credidi me,*' says he, '*pro regula generali sumere posse, omne id quod dilucidé et distincté concipiebam verum esse.*' That conception is independent of the will, nobody has disputed. When any conceivable thing is presented to our conception, we can no more avoid conceiving it, than feeling pain when we are hurt.

"There are two propositions, therefore, of the greatest certainty, and the greatest importance.

"The first is this, that, as the mind is passive in belief, and the will, to use the words of Dr. Clarke, has nothing at all to do with it, neither merit nor demerit can ever be ascribed to belief, without the utmost confusion of ideas, and the risk of a deplorable train of the most immoral consequences.

"The second is, that, as the mind is not passive in what it does relating to evidence, but has all the activity which is implied in its most voluntary exertions, merit or demerit may be justly ascribed to it.

"On his mode of dealing with evidence, the good or evil application of the powers of the man, in other words, the greatest possible *dégré* either of virtue or of vice, almost wholly depends.

"The evidence of this proposition is short and conclusive. The outward acts of the man follow the inward acts of the will; the acts of the will follow the last determinations of the understanding; the determinations of the understanding follow the evidence present to the mind. The outward acts of the man, therefore, are all precisely such as the evidence which he has in his contemplation determines them to be.

"Proper dealing with evidence consist of two things. First, the full collection of it; secondly, the equal reception of it.

"With regard to the first, it is knowledge that is concerned. With regard to the second, it is fairness.

"*Fulness of Collection.*—1. When a man gives himself no concern about evidence, he remains in voluntary ignorance. The degree of criminality which is involved in this, admits of all degrees, according to the nature of the case. Where it is of little importance, whether a man is or is not ignorant, very little blame can attach to his ignorance; where it would be impossible for him to acquire knowledge, however important, without neglecting it where it is still of greater importance, ignorance may deserve praise rather than blame. There are cases, however, in which voluntary ignorance implies the greatest wickedness; and a habit of voluntary ignorance, a habit, to a certain degree predominant, of indifference to evidence on important points, implies one of the most odious and disgusting states of intellectual and moral depravity.

"*Equality of Reception.*—2. The criminality of unfairness, also, of course, admits of degrees, according to the less or greater

importance of the occasion on which it is incurred. The nature of the offence, in a general way, is sufficiently suggested by the name. It consists in leaning too much to one side. The opposite virtue consists in having no leaning to either side.

“What is included in this? Two things are included. The first is, that we have no affection to the one side more than the other. The second is, that we bestow equal attention upon the evidence on both sides.

1. First, it is required that we have no affection to the one side more than the other. When there is an affection to the one side, a wish that the truth should be found on that side, a wish that it should not be found on the other, the weaker evidence on the favourite side produces more impression, than the stronger evidence on the other. By what delusive process of the mind this unhappy effect is produced, we shall by and by explore. At present we have to do with the certainty of the fact, and the extent of its influence.

“A man must have looked abroad upon the world to very little purpose, who has not observed how invariably every class of men have provided themselves with a set of opinions, grounded upon the feelings connected with their own interests, and not upon the evidentials of the case. The aristocratical class have opinions of a superiority inherent in themselves; and inferiority inherent in the other classes. Wherein consists the pride of birth? Whence arises the belief of something noble or ignoble in the blood, with all the practical feelings which result from it, and all the great consequences on life of which such feelings are the proximate cause?

“Whence are derived that remarkable class of opinions which are held by the white masters respecting their black slaves, in the West Indies, and in America? The opinion of the utter degradation of the sable race; the opinion of such a superiority in the fair race, that any the smallest tinge in the blood of an individual, whatever his worth, whatever even his riches, makes him unfit to associate with one whose veins contain the European liquid in elevating, ennobling purity?

“How difficult is it to find a man who does not over estimate the importance of the particular faculty in which he excels? Look at the tribe of lawyers, the class who hire their tongues as readily to promote what is iniquitous and cruel, as what is just and humane. Their self-importance rises to the ridiculous; were it not for them, the race of men, they tell us, could hardly exist.

“What need to speak of the exaggerations of the clergy, in magnifying their own importance, and that of the services which they render to the rest of men?

“How excessive the over-estimate which a fond mother com-



monly makes of the perfections of her child ! How blind to its defects ; how possessed with every point of its excellence !

“ Every body can adduce sufficient cases to show what sport the affections make with the understanding, and has observed how small the number of human creatures whose decisions can be depended upon whenever the affections interfere with the judgment.

“ Practically speaking, therefore, it is never safe to come to the examination of any question, without a strict examination of the affections. When we proceed to the investigation of any question, the first thing required is, a process of self-examination. Have I any affection on either side ? If not, I may safely proceed to ascertain and weigh the evidentials on both sides. If, however, the result of the self-examination is, that I have an affection on the one side, and none on the other, what must I do ? The proper plan would be, if it could be done, to abolish the affection on that side ; and so come to the study of the question free from affection on either side ; or, if this could not be done, to raise, if it were possible, an equal affection on the other side. If it were the question for a fond mother to decide, whether her own or another child were the most amiable, it would be necessary, for a fair decision, either that she should divest herself, for the time, of her peculiar affection to the one side, or put on an equal affection for the other. This generally is impossible ; and then, there is only one other resource, that of making an allowance for the efficacy of the affection. As evidence which favours an affection, of equal force with evidence which makes against it, appears of greater force to the mind which is under the influence of the affection, it is necessary to such a mind, if it would be fair, to allow greater weight to the evidence opposite to the affection than it seems to have, and less to that which favours it. Thus, if it appears that the evidence which makes against the affection, and that which makes in its favour, are of equal force, we ought to conclude that the evidence which makes against it is the stronger. If a fond mother sees another child which she thinks equally admirable with her own, she may be very sure that it is better.”

#### SPECIMEN OF A PAMPERED ARISTOCRAT,

TAKEN FROM “ THE TIMES ” NEWSPAPER.

OUGHT such a man to be considered sane, and be allowed to manage such an accumulated capital ?

#### THE EARL OF BRIDGEWATER.

The following probably overcharged, but curious account of this eccentric character, appears in a Paris paper :—“ Some persons, knowing but imperfectly this model of originals, past, present, and to come, and appear

ing desirous to learn something more respecting him, we think it may be agreeable, if we collect such anecdotes respecting such a singular personage as are well calculated to enrich the history of human oddities. No one has higher claims to a distinguished place in such history than M. Egerton, who has for several years borne the name of Lord Bridgewater. Those who have once seen—nay, those who have never seen this meagre personage drag himself along, supported by two huge lacqueys, with his sugar-loaf hat, slouched down over his eyes, cannot fail to recognize him. An immense fortune enables him to gratify the most extravagant caprices that ever passed through the head of a rich Englishman. If he be lent a book, he carries his politeness so far as to send it back, or rather have it conducted home in a carriage. He gives orders that two of his most stately steeds be caparisoned under one of his chariots, and the volume, reclining at ease in milord's landau, arrives, attended by four footmen in costly livery, at the door of its astounded owner. His carriage is frequently to be seen filled with his dogs. He bestows great care on the feet of these dogs, and orders them boots, for which he pays as dearly as for his own. Lord Bridgewater's custom is an excellent one for the boot-maker; for, besides the four feet of each of his dogs, the supply of his own two feet must give constant employment to several operatives. He puts on a new pair of boots every day, carefully preserving those he has once worn, and ranging them in order; he commands that none shall touch them, but takes himself great pleasure in observing how much of the year he has each day past, by viewing the state of his boots. Lord Bridgewater is a man of few acquaintance, and very few of his countrymen have got as far as his dining-hall. His table, however, is constantly set out with a dozen covers, and served by a suitable attendance. Who then are his privileged guests? No less than a dozen of favourite dogs, who daily partake of milord's dinner, seated very gravely in armed chairs, each with a napkin round his neck, and a servant behind to attend to his wants. These honourable quadrupeds, as if grateful for such delicate attentions, comport themselves during the time of repast, with a decency and decorum which would do more than honour to a party of gentlemen; but if, by any chance, one of them should, without due consideration, obey the natural instinct of his appetite, and transgress any of the rules of good manners, his punishment is at hand. You, perhaps, gentle reader, suppose that corporal punishment is meant, as the walls of the capital so eloquently but so ineffectually define it; but no—you are mistaken, 'tis in his self-love that the offender is punished. The day following the day of his offence the dog dines, and even dines well; but not at milord's table, and as becomes a dog to dine: banished to the ante-chamber, and dressed in livery, he eats in sorrow the bread of shame, and picks the bone of mortification, while his place at table remains vacant till his repentance has merited a generous pardon! We have not been able to learn what dress Lord Egerton puts on his domestics, when he has cause to be dissatisfied with their service!

---

#### TO THE EDITOR OF "THE REPUBLICAN."

SIR,  
If I were disposed to amuse myself at the expence of your Correspondent, F. P., his waspish article in your last Number would



supply me with abundant materials; but however low I may stand in that gentleman's estimation on account of my hostility to his favourite speculations, I trust I know too well what is due to the readers of "The Republican," and to my own respectability, to indulge in either unseasonable merriment or dogmatical ill humour.

F. P. says he was not a party to the contest; what meaning he affixes to the word contest I know not, but his letters and essays are in the columns of "The Republican," and unless some critical cavil be implied in the phrase, "what he calls the contest," his assertion must pass for nothing.

It is equally unfounded that I have "imputed motives and called names;" I have done neither one nor the other: if "*a tub to the whale*" be a cap fitted to his noddle, he is welcome to wear it; but I did not intend it for either him or any other individual. I know F. P. only as an anonymous Correspondent of "The Republican;" and certainly it never entered my mind to impute to one who describes himself as a *ci-devant* "poor leather-breeches maker," a design to mislead the people of the three kingdoms! As to calling names, I have called him nothing but a Political Economist: if he and those who think with him dislike the term, let them rebaptize themselves; I will endeavour to pay all proper respect to their new cognomination.

That I have once or twice alluded, in somewhat satirical terms, to public writers and lecturers, I readily admit—had I not a right? But I defy F. P. or any one else to point out a single line or phrase which can be deemed personally offensive to him. Let him select one which he thinks the worst; I will cheerfully leave it to the judgment of any twelve readers of "The Republican," and, if their decision be against me, make a full and an immediate retraction.

But how stands the matter with *him*? Are *his* hands so clean as to entitle him to the first throw, even at the guilty? I have reperused the four letters of F. P. beginning with his rude attack upon Mr. Single, and found upwards of twenty expressions, applied personally to him and me, the mildest and most courteous of which is "deplorably ignorant."

But this writer's want of precision in these respects is quite equalled by his want of candour in others; who would not imagine, from the following passage in his last letter, that it was really true that he had never contested or discussed the subjects of machinery and population with me? Alluding to my assertion, that he had withdrawn from the contest, he says, "*J. F. quarrelled with an article which you copied from 'The Bolton Chronicle';*" but that did not make me a party in what he calls the contest." Now, if the reader will take the trouble to turn to p. 147. he will find, in a letter of four pages, written by F. P. expressly in reply to me, this passage:—"Only a few days ago I

sent an essay to a provincial paper on machinery, wages, and population; I will send one of these papers to Mr. Carlile for J. F. Mr. Carlile will probably give the essay a place in his 'Republican.' This requires no comment.

I should be sorry, Sir, to occupy the columns of "The Republican" with such matter as this, did I not feel that I was defending those principles of free discussion which its Editor so nobly maintains. F. P.'s anger "yearns not me;" but the tone which he assumes might, if unresisted, deter many a valuable aspirant to public utility from taking part in any discussion, and doom to "the desert air" talents which under better treatment might have contributed largely to the public good.

I have stated more than once, in express terms, that I believed F. P.'s motives to be good, (though he has disingenuously accused me of the reverse) and as it is possible that he may have meant well even in using the supercilious expressions which distinguish his last letter, I will not be ungrateful: I will give him a word or two of advice at parting. If he is a young man, as by his faulty style and abundant zeal I should take him to be, he will perhaps thank me when my bald pate shall be mouldering in the dust.

Let him in his future writings, especially if his object be to make proselytes, mingle a little more of the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*. All who differ from him in opinion may be "deplorably ignorant," but he can do no good by telling them so.—

"Men must be taught as tho' you taught them not,  
And things unknown conveyed as things forgot."

I would advise him too, neither to presume too much upon those professions of inability with which every really modest and well-informed writer, or speaker, prefaces his observations, nor to say in print, even in reply to the most ignorant anonymous opponent, what he dare not say orally in good society.

J. F.

Oct. 17.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 62, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican," to be left at the place of publication.